

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the foregoing amendments be made prior to examination of the present application.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 are currently being amended.

Claims 37-39 are currently being added.

This supplemental amendment and reply adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-39 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 8, 9, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,161,105 to Kugimiya et al.; claims 3, 10, 17, 22, 27 and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,359,849 to Palmquist; claims 4, 11, 18, 23, 28 and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,727,082 to Sugishima; claims 5, 7, 12, 14, 19, 24, 26, 29, 31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,490,563 to Hon et al.; and claims 6, 13, 20, 25, 30 and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kugimiya et al. in view of Hone et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,944,464 to Muranaga. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

Independent claim 1 recites the generating of a notation in a first language to identify a proper noun described in a second language. In order to specify, in a first language, a

proper noun in a second language, wherein the proper noun in the first language corresponding to the proper noun in the second language is not unique, e.g. “Aachen” (see paragraph [0017] in the present specification) has at least two different sounds, i.e., an English pronounced sound and a German pronounced sound, a proper noun dictionary must store all possible proper nouns in the first language corresponding to the proper noun in the second language. Furthermore, for a user not familiar with the phonetic characters and the phonetic symbols (see paragraph [0040] in the present specification), reading or inputting the proper noun in the first language would be difficult, and the proper noun dictionary, which stores a pair of proper nouns in the first language and in the second language, may not be referred to.

In the present invention, such as exemplified in embodiment 2, a user can uniquely specify a proper noun in a second language, by viewing a table, such as the one shown in Figure 5 of the drawings, which displays the proper noun in the second language with a label corresponding to it, e.g. ,“Place name 2”. According to this feature of the present application, any user can obtain a correct translation result with a high processing speed.

Furthermore, the present application can be applied to, e.g., an English to Chinese translation, wherein a non-Chinese user is not familiar with reading of a Chinese character.

Turning now to the cited art of record, Kugimiya is quite different from the present application as exemplified by the independent claims under rejection, whereby Kugimiya does not disclose or suggest the generating of a notation to identify a proper noun described in a second language, and it does not teach or suggest displaying a pair including the proper noun and the notation. For example, column 1, lines 64-67 of Kugimiya describes displaying a source language and a target language that has been translated, but this is different from displaying a proper noun and a notation as a pair.

Accordingly, the independent claims under rejection patentably distinguish over Kugimiya.

New Claims:

New dependent claims 37-39 have been added, whereby these claims recite that the notation is generated as a phonetic equivalent of the proper noun in the first language.

Kugimiya et al. describes a system for determining whether a sentence construction analysis is a proper noun with an acronym, whereby no notation is generated as a phonetic equivalent of a proper noun in a first language in the system of Kugimiya et al.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Supplemental Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 11, 2009

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6014
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

George C. Beck
Registration No. 38,072

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819